

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 24, 26-27 and 29-33 were pending. Claims 1, 3 and 30 have been amended. Claims 34-36 have been added. Claims 1, 3 and 30 are independent claims. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

In addition, and as set forth below, Applicants also respectfully submit that the finality of the rejections is premature.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Request for Withdrawal of Finality of Rejection

Applicants respectfully note MPEP 706.07(a), which states that, under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the Examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement

In view thereof, Applicants respectfully submit that the final rejections in the Office Action are premature.

For example, Applicants respectfully point out that the Final Office Action introduced a new ground of rejection in regard to claim 1, which at the time of the Final Office Action recited the subject matter of previously pending claim 5 (compare final rejection of claim 1 to prior non final rejection of claim 5).

Since at the time of the Final Office Action, claim 1 recited the subject matter of previously pending claim 5, the new ground of rejection was not necessitated by an amendment of the claim.

Nor was the new ground of rejection based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the rejections be withdrawn (see MPEP 706.07(d)).

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3 and 30 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1, 3 and 30 are supported, for example, at one or more portions of page 7, lines 26-31 and page 21, lines 28-32.

Claims 34-36 have been added. Added claims 34-36 are supported, for example, at one or more portions of page 8, lines 6-7.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018510 (Sanches) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0024629 (Kirby et al.) and further in view of Stevens, Richard, TCP/IP Illustrated, Volume 1: The Protocols, December 31, 1993 (Stevens).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 1 now recites a computer program product for facilitating an enterprise change, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: displaying **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate;** executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, **the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate,** the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a markup language, the base system connectors including an interface with remote function call capability; and displaying a user interface on a computer

display to conduct a merger activity, wherein the user interface displayed on the computer display includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including: creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force; generating a schedule for the task force to follow; generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders. (emphasis added).

Neither Sanches nor Kirby et al. nor Stevens nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the computer program product of claim 1.

Sanches disclose that a computer implemented method, system, and software of planning and managing an initiative, includes planning the initiative by determining the initiative tasks; generating an action plan including action items to accomplish the initiative tasks; and generating a dynamic organizational model to support the execution of the action plan, the organizational model comprising initiative participants, relationships between the initiative participants, and attributes of the initiative participants (abstract).

Thus, Sanches disclose planning and managing an initiative.

However, Sanches does not teach or suggest **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate.**

Nor does Sanches teach or suggest executing **pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate.**

In view at least thereof, Sanches does not teach or suggest displaying **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate;** executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, **the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate,** as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Nor does Kirby et al., Stevens nor any combination of Sanches, Kirby et al. and Stevens proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest displaying a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate; executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Sanches nor Kirby et al. nor Stevens nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest a computer program product for facilitating an enterprise change, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: displaying a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate; executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate, the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a markup language, the base system connectors including an interface with remote function call capability; and displaying a user interface on a computer display to conduct a merger activity, wherein the user interface displayed on the computer display includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including: creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force; generating a schedule for the task force to follow; generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 3

Claim 3 has been amended.

Claim 3 now recites a computer program product, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: displaying a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of a merger candidate; executing, via a single logical physically distributed information system representing one or more source systems of at least two enterprises that are being combined, one or more pre-merger activities, merger activities, and post-merger activities, the one or more pre-merger activities including one or more pre-merger activities associated with pre-merger due diligence on the merger candidate, the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a markup language, the base system connectors including an interface with remote function call capability; and displaying a user interface on a computer display to access the single logical physically distributed information system, wherein the user interface displayed on the computer display includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including: creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force; generating a schedule for the task force to follow; generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders. (emphasis added).

Neither Sanches nor Kirby et al. nor Stevens nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the computer program product of claim 3.

Sanches disclose that a computer implemented method, system, and software of planning and managing an initiative, includes planning the initiative by determining the initiative tasks; generating an action plan including action items to accomplish the initiative tasks; and generating a dynamic organizational model to support the execution of the action plan, the organizational model comprising initiative participants, relationships between the initiative participants, and attributes of the initiative participants (abstract).

Thus, Sanches disclose planning and managing an initiative.

However, Sanches does not teach or suggest a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of a merger candidate.

Nor does Sanches teach or suggest executing one or more pre-merger activities including one or more pre-merger activities associated with pre-merger due diligence on the merger candidate.

In view of at least thereof, Sanches does not teach or suggest displaying a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of a merger candidate; executing, via a single logical physically distributed information system representing one or more source systems of at least two enterprises that are being combined, one or more pre-merger activities, merger activities, and post-merger activities, the one or more pre-merger activities including one or more pre-merger activities associated with pre-merger due diligence on the merger candidate, as recited in claim 3 (emphasis added).

Nor does Kirby et al., Stevens nor any combination of Sanches, Kirby et al. and Stevens proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest displaying a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of a merger candidate; executing, via a single logical physically distributed information system representing one or more source systems of at least two enterprises that are being combined, one or more pre-merger activities, merger activities, and post-merger activities, the one or more pre-merger activities including one or more pre-merger activities associated with pre-merger due diligence on the merger candidate, as recited in claim 3 (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Sanches nor Kirby et al. nor Stevens nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest a computer program product, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: displaying a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of a merger candidate; executing, via a single logical physically distributed information system representing one or more source systems of at least two enterprises that are being combined, one or more pre-merger activities, merger activities, and

post-merger activities, **the one or more pre-merger activities including one or more pre-merger activities associated with pre-merger due diligence on the merger candidate**, the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a markup language, the base system connectors including an interface with remote function call capability; and displaying a user interface on a computer display to access the single logical physically distributed information system, wherein the user interface displayed on the computer display includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including: creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force; generating a schedule for the task force to follow; generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders, as recited in claim 3. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 30

Claim 30 has been amended.

Claim 30 now recites a computer program product for facilitating an enterprise change, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: displaying **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate**; executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, **the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate**, the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a web service; and displaying a user interface on a computer display to conduct a merger activity, wherein the user interface displayed on the computer display includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including: creating a task force and

assigning team members to the task force; generating a schedule for the task force to follow; generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders. (emphasis added).

Neither Sanches nor Kirby et al. nor Stevens nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the computer program product of claim 30.

Sanches disclose that a computer implemented method, system, and software of planning and managing an initiative, includes planning the initiative by determining the initiative tasks; generating an action plan including action items to accomplish the initiative tasks; and generating a dynamic organizational model to support the execution of the action plan, the organizational model comprising initiative participants, relationships between the initiative participants, and attributes of the initiative participants (abstract).

Thus, Sanches disclose planning and managing an initiative.

However, Sanches does not teach or suggest **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate.**

Nor does Sanches teach or suggest executing **pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate.**

In view at least thereof, Sanches does not teach or suggest displaying **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate;** executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, **the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate,** as recited in claim 30 (emphasis added).

Nor does Kirby et al., Stevens nor any combination of Sanches, Kirby et al. and Stevens proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest displaying **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate;** executing, via two or more source

systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, **the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate,** as recited in claim 30 (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Sanches nor Kirby et al. nor Stevens nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest a computer program product for facilitating an enterprise change, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising: displaying **a user interface in association with a deal selection process, the user interface including a view that includes a profile of at least one of a merger candidate and acquisition candidate;** executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, **the pre-change due diligence including operations associated with pre-change due diligence on the at least one of the merger candidate and acquisition candidate,** the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a web service; and displaying a user interface on a computer display to conduct a merger activity, wherein the user interface displayed on the computer display includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including: creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force; generating a schedule for the task force to follow; generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders, as recited in claim 30. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims

Claims 2, 24, 26 and 34 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 4-5, 27, 29 and 35 depend from independent claim 3 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 3.

Claims 31-33 and 36 depend from independent claim 30 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 30.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Because the reasons set forth above are sufficient to overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants do not address some of the assertions set forth therein and/or other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections. Nonetheless, Applicants reserve the right to address such assertions and/or to present other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections in any future paper and/or proceeding.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0006, ext. 1014.

Respectfully submitted,

December 14, 2010
Date

/Mark Steinberg/
Mark Steinberg
Registration No. 40,829
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0006, ext. 1014